

### Remarks

Entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Claims 18-21, 39-42 and 66-69 remain pending.

In the Office Action, dated June 16, 2005, claims 1-15, 17, 19-33, 35-36, 38, 40-44, 47-60, 62-63, 67-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph; claims 1-3, 9, 14, 22-24, 30, 43-44, 49-51 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pothapragada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,682) in view of Hill et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,239); claims 4-5, 25-26 and 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pothapragada and Hill and further in view of Kahle (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,712); claims 6-7, 27-28 and 54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pothapragada, Hill and Kahle and further in view of Ryan (U.S. Patent No. 5,367,656); claims 8, 29 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pothapragada and Hill in view of Lopez-Aguado et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,810); claims 10, 31 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pothapragada and Hill in view of Ryan; claims 11, 32, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pothapragada, Hill and Ryan and further in view of Lopez-Aguado; claims 17, 20, 38, 41, 47-48, 65 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pothapragada in view of Hill; claims 19, 40 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pothapragada and Hill and further in view of Lopez-Aguado et al.; claims 21, 42 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pothapragada and Hill and further in view of Ryan; claims 13, 34, 61 and 68 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims as to overcome the §112 rejection; and claims 18, 39, and 66 are allowed.

In a bonafide attempt to advance prosecution of this application, and not in acquiescence to any of the rejections, applicants have amended claims 19, 20, 40, 41, 67 and 68 to depend from an allowed claim and have cancelled claims 1-15, 17, 22-36, 38, 43-44, 47-63 and 65, without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to file continuing applications for the remaining subject matter of this application.

Applicants respectfully request that this amendment be entered after final, since it places the application in better condition for allowance.

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with applicants' attorney, please contact applicants' attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller  
Blanche E. Schiller  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: August 16, 2005.

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.  
5 Columbia Circle  
Albany, New York 12203-5160  
Telephone: (518) 452-5600  
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579